(Revised)

UNCLASSIFIED

Feb 24

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Proposed US Comments on revised MEDO Paper of June 27, and UK proposals for changes in that paper, dated July 7

1952 JUL 9 PM 5 05

Middle East

1. The US considers the June 27 draft of the UK MEDO paper a suitable basis for a preliminary exchange of views among the sponsoring powers, and suggests that the UK circulate the paper as soon as possible. The US may wish to propose certain changes in the paper in the course of this exchange of views, and assumes that the UK may also desire to propose further modifications.

2. The US is of the opinion that it would not now be desirable to amend the draft of June 27 in the manner proposed in the UK memorandum handed the Department of State July 7. Our reasons for objecting to the proposed changes follow. (Paragraphing corresponds with that in the UK memorandum).

(a) The language of the draft of June 27 relating to the location of MEDO is in general terms and allows for adaptation to any changes in the situation which may develop in the course of our approach to the Arab States. We do not disagree with the position as stated in the British revision but feel that the document need not be so specific at this stage. We think the language of the draft of June 27 is preferable and should be retained, but would have no objection to the British orally stating their preference at the time the paper is circulated.

Para 6 & 9

(b)(c) The changes proposed in paragraphs 6 and 9 of the draft of June 27 are not consistent with the view expressed by the US that coordination among the US, UK, France and Turkey, as members of NATO and as participants in MEDO, should be achieved by ad hoc arrangements outside of MEDO. We believe, therefore, that paragraphs 6 and 9 should not be modified.

Para 14

(d) We do not think the proposed change in paragraph 14 should be accepted. The problem of how best to approach the Arab States is of crucial importance. We plan to give it additional study while the MEDO paper circulates among the sponsoring powers and in any event would not wish to take a final position on the matter before consulting our Chiefs of Mission in the Arab capitals. For this reason we think the language dealing with this matter should be general and flexible. Moreover, we are not prepared at this time to make a commitment to proceed with the establishment of the organization regardless of Arab sentiment. As the Secretary clearly stated to Mr. Eden, we would have serious reservations about proceeding and would wish to reassess the situation if the Arabs appear hostile to the Organization. In our opinion, the language of the draft of June 27, which provides essential flexibility on this point, should be retained.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE A/CDS DECLASSIFICATION DATE 6/28/78
UNCLASSIFIED REVIEWED FOR INFORMATION PER VEIOTES OFFICE NEA
DATE 6/11/82 720115
RDS or XDS EXT. DATE
TS AUTH. REASON(S)
ENDORSE EXISTING MARKINGS
DECLASSIFIED RELEASABLE
RELEASE DENIED
PA or FOI EXEMPTIONS

NEA/Daspit
7/8/52